# Harvard Triples

## 1NC – CP (0:55)

#### CP Text: Space faring nations should establish a multilateral agreement that restricts asteroid mining done by private entities except for on asteroid Kamo’oalewa.

#### Kamo’oalewa is an asteroid comprised of lunar material

Devlin 21 [Hannah Devlin is the Guardian's science correspondent, having previously been science editor of the Times. “Near-Earth asteroid is a fragment from the moon, say scientists.” November 11, 2021. https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/nov/11/near-earth-asteroid-is-a-fragment-from-the-moon-say-scientists]

Scientists have identified what appears to be a small chunk of the moon that is tracking the Earth’s orbit around the Sun. The asteroid, named Kamo`oalewa, was discovered in 2016 but until now relatively little has been known about it. New observations suggest it could be a fragment from the moon that was thrown into space by an ancient lunar collision. Kamo`oalewa is one of Earth’s quasi-satellites, a category of asteroid that orbits the Sun, but remains relatively close to the planet – in this case about 9m miles away. Despite being close in astronomical terms, the asteroid is about the size of a ferris wheel and about 4m times fainter than the faintest star that can be seen with the naked eye. Consequently, the Earth’s most powerful telescopes are needed to make observations. Using the Large Binocular Telescope on Mount Graham in southern Arizona, astronomers found the spectrum of reflected light from Kamo`oalewa closely matched lunar rocks from Nasa’s Apollo missions, suggesting it originated from the moon. They had initially compared the light with that reflected off other near-Earth asteroids, but drawn a blank. “I looked through every near-Earth asteroid spectrum we had access to, and nothing matched,” said Ben Sharkey, a PhD student at the University of Arizona and the paper’s lead author. After missing the chance to observe Kamo`oalewa in April 2020 owing to a shutdown of the telescope during the coronavirus pandemic, the team found the final piece of the puzzle in 2021. “This spring, we got much needed follow-up observations and went, ‘Wow it is real,’” Sharkey said. “It’s easier to explain with the moon than other ideas.”

#### Space based solar power is being developed and transitions to 100% clean energy, but lunar regolith is key

O’Neill 13 [Ian O'Neill is a media relations specialist at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) in Southern California. Prior to joining JPL, he served as editor for the Astronomical Society of the Pacific‘s Mercury magazine and Mercury Online and contributed articles to a number of other publications, including Space.com, Space.com, Live Science, HISTORY.com, Scientific American. Ian holds a Ph.D in solar physics and a master's degree in planetary and space physics. “How to Turn the Moon Into a Giant Space Solar Power Hub.” December 3, 2013. https://www.space.com/23810-moon-luna-belt-solar-power-idea.html]

When it comes to space and energy, we need to think big. That's what one Japanese company is doing — and they're reaching for the moon, literally. The best thing about the moon is that one lunar hemisphere is constantly bathed in sunlight (except for the occasional eclipse), so using solar arrays to generate power may not seem like such a stretch. Take China's recently-launched Chang'e 3 Yutu rover for example, it's solar powered. Also, Apollo astronauts set up solar-powered experiments on the lunar regolith. But how about wrapping the moon's equator in a 250 mile wide band of solar panels and beaming the power generated back to Earth? That's exactly what Shimizu Corporation is proposing and they reckon their concept could harness a steady stream of 13,000 terawatts of power. According to Business Insider, "the total installed electricity generation summer capacity in the United States was 1,050.9 gigawatts." Such a vast energy resource could be transformative for our civilization. As Obi-Wan might say: "That's no moon. It's a space (solar power) station." "A shift from economical use of limited resources to the unlimited use of clean energy is the ultimate dream of all mankind," says the company's website. "The LUNA RING, our lunar solar power generation concept, translates this dream into reality through ingenious ideas coupled with advanced space technologies." Indeed, advanced space technologies will be needed, not only to harvest solar energy and efficiently beam it back to Earth, but its very construction will require several leaps in robotic technology development. Also, this mother of all engineering tasks will need to see some significant changes in international space treaties before it sees light of day. Resembling a moon born from science fiction, the LUNA RING is just that, a ring around the moon. The ring, stretching 6,800 miles around the moon's circumference, will be constructed by robots that will "perform various tasks on the lunar surface, including ground leveling and excavation of hard bottom strata." The entire project will be overseen by a team of humans while the bulk of the robotic tasks can be teleoperated from Earth. [Moon Base Visions: How to Build a Lunar Colony (Photos)] It’s all very well building a huge array of solar panels around the moon, but how would the power be sent to Earth? As our atmosphere is virtually transparent to microwaves and lasers, Shimizu envisages solar energy being fed through microwave/laser transmitters located around the Earth-facing side of the moon. As the moon orbits the Earth and the Earth rotates, international receiving stations will feed electricity grids with plentiful lunar solar power as the moon rises to when it sets. The designers are keen to point out that this is a green energy resource that could benefit the whole of mankind. What's more, when the infrastructure is set up, other resources can be exploited — such as mining for precious minerals and fabricating products from regolith. One could imagine an international consortium of nations and/or companies that buy a stake in the LUNA RING to aid its construction. Each partner would then have rights to construct receiving stations in their geographical location of choice, weaning us off polluting sources of power. Japan, which was hurt by the devastating Fukushima meltdown in 2011, is actively seeking out alternative power resources to wean itself off nuclear energy — it doesn't get more "alternative" than this.

**Warming causes extinction and guarantees every other impact**

Spratt and Dunplop 19, David Spratt [Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne, and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action] & Ian Dunlop [member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000], “Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach,” Breakthrough - National Centre for Climate Restoration, May 2019, pg. 8-10, beckert. Brackets in original text

2020–2030: Policy-makers fail to act on evidence that the current ​Paris Agreement path — in which global human-caused greenhouse emissions do not peak until 2030 — will lock in at least 3°C of warming. The case for a global, climate-emergency mobilisation of labour and resources to build a zero-emission economy and carbon drawdown in order to have a realistic chance of keeping warming well below 2°C is politely ignored. As projected by Xu and Ramanathan, by 2030 carbon dioxide levels have reached 437 parts per million — which is unprecedented in the last 20 million years — and warming reaches 1.6°C.18 2030–2050: Emissions peak in 2030, and start to fall consistent with an 80 percent reduction in fossil-fuel energy intensity by 2100 compared to 2010 energy intensity. This leads to warming of 2.4°C by 2050, consistent with the Xu and Ramanathan “baseline-fast” scenario.19 However, another 0.6°C of warming occurs — taking the total to 3°C by 2050 — due to the activation of a number of carbon-cycle feedbacks and higher levels of ice albedo and cloud feedbacks than current models assume. [It should be noted that this is far from an extreme scenario: the low-probability, high-impact warming (five percent probability) can exceed 3.5–4°C by 2050 in the Xu and Ramanathan scheme.] 2050: By 2050, there is broad scientific acceptance that system tipping-points for the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and a sea-ice-free Arctic summer were passed well before 1.5°C of warming, for the Greenland Ice Sheet well before 2°C, and for widespread permafrost loss and large-scale Amazon drought and dieback by 2.5°C. The “**hothouse Earth**” scenario has been realised, and Earth is headed for another degree or more of warming, especially since human greenhouse emissions are still significant.20 While sea levels have risen 0.5 metres by 2050, the increase may be 2–3 metres by 2100, and it is understood from historical analogues that seas may eventually rise by more than 25 metres. Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of **lethal heat** conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability. The destabilisation of the Jet Stream has very significantly affected the intensity and geographical distribution of the Asian and West African monsoons and, together with the further slowing of the Gulf Stream, is impinging on life support systems in Europe. North America suffers from devastating weather extremes including wildfires, heatwaves, drought and inundation. The summer monsoons in China have failed, and water flows into the great rivers of Asia are severely reduced by the loss of more than one-third of the Himalayan ice sheet. Glacial loss reaches 70 percent in the Andes, and rainfall in Mexico and central America falls by half. Semi-permanent El Nino conditions prevail. Aridification emerges over more than 30 percent of the world’s land surface. Desertification is severe in southern Africa, the southern Mediterranean, west Asia, the Middle East, inland Australia and across the south-western United States. Impacts: A number of **ecosystems collapse**, including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic. Some poorer nations and regions, which lack capacity to provide artificially-cooled environments for their populations, **become unviable**. Deadly heat conditions persist for more than 100 days per year in West Africa, tropical South America, the Middle East and South-East Asia, contributing to **more than a billion people being displaced** from the tropical zone. **Water availability decreases sharply** in the most affected regions at lower latitudes (dry tropics and subtropics), affecting about **two billion** people worldwide. Agriculture becomes nonviable in the dry subtropics. Most regions in the world see a significant drop in food production and increasing numbers of extreme weather events, including heat waves, floods and storms. Food production is inadequate to feed the global population and food prices skyrocket, as a consequence of a one-fifth decline in crop yields, a decline in the nutrition content of food crops, a catastrophic decline in insect populations, desertification, monsoon failure and chronic water shortages, and conditions too hot for human habitation in significant food-growing regions. The lower reaches of the agriculturally-important river deltas such as the Mekong, Ganges and Nile are inundated, and significant sectors of some of the world’s most populous cities — including Chennai, Mumbai, Jakarta, Guangzhou, Tianjin, Hong Kong, Ho Chi Minh City, Shanghai, Lagos, Bangkok and Manila — are abandoned. Some small islands become uninhabitable. Ten percent of Bangladesh is inundated, displacing 15 million people. Even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated and In high-end scenarios, the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a **high likelihood of human civilisation coming to an end**.21 National security consequences: For pragmatic reasons associated with providing only a sketch of this scenario, we take the conclusion of the ​Age of Consequences ‘Severe’ 3°C scenario developed by a group of senior US national-security figures in 2007 as appropriate for our scenario too: Massive nonlinear events in the global environment give rise to ​massive nonlinear societal events.​ In this scenario, nations around the world will be ​overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The internal cohesion of nations will be under great stress, **including in the United States**, both as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world, especially in the Netherlands, the United States, South Asia, and China, has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities.​ **Armed conflict** between nations over resources, such as the Nile and its tributaries, is likely and **nuclear war** is possible. The social consequences range from increased religious fervor to ​outright chaos.​ In this scenario, climate change provokes ​a permanent shift in the relationship of humankind to nature​’.22 (emphasis added) DISCUSSION This scenario provides a glimpse into a world of “outright chaos” on a path to the end of human civilisation and modern society as we have known it, in which the challenges to global security are simply overwhelming and political panic becomes the norm. Yet the world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of catastrophic climate change.23 What can be done to avoid such a probable but catastrophic future? It is clear from our preliminary scenario that dramatic action is required this decade if the “hothouse Earth” scenario is to be avoided. To reduce this risk and protect human civilisation, a massive global mobilisation of resources is needed in the coming decade to build a zero-emissions industrial system and set in train the restoration of a safe climate. This would be akin in scale to the World War II emergency mobilisation. There is an increasing awareness that such a response is now necessary. Prof. Kevin Anderson makes the case for a Marshall Plan-style construction of zero-carbon-dioxide energy supply and major electrification to build a zero-carbon industrial strategy by “a shift in productive capacity of society akin to that in World War II”.24 Others have warned that “**only a drastic, economy-wide makeover within the next decade**, consistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C”, would avoid the transition of the Earth System to the Pliocene-like conditions that prevailed 3-3.3 million years ago, when temperatures were ~3°C and sea levels 25 metres higher.25 It should be noted here that the 1.5° goal is not safe for a number of Earth System elements, including Arctic sea-ice, West Antarctica and coral reefs.

## FW (2:50)

#### Agents must be practical reasoners:

#### First, inescapability – the exercise of practical rationality requires that one regards it as intrinsically good – that justifies a right to freedom.

Wood [Allen W. Wood, (Stanford University, California) "Kantian Ethics" Cambridge University Press, 2007, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/kantian-ethics/769B8CD9FCC74DB6870189AE1645FAC8, DOA:8-12-2020 // WWBW]//rct st

Kant holds that the most basic act through which people exercise their practical rationality is that of setting an end (G 4:437). To set an end is, analytically, to subject yourself to the hypothetical imperative that you should take the necessary means to the end you have set (G 4:417). This is the claim that you rationally ought to do something whether or not you are at the moment inclined to do it. It represents the action of applying that means as good (G 4:414) – in the sense of “good” that Kant explicates as: what is required by reason independently of inclination (G 4:413). Kant correctly infers that any being which sets itself ends is committed to regarding its end as good in this sense, and also to regarding the goodness of its end as what also makes application of the means good – that is, rationally required independently of any inclination to apply it. The act of setting an end, therefore, must be taken as committing you to represent some other act (the act of applying the means) as good. In doing all this, however, the rational being must also necessarily regard its own rational capacities as authoritative for what is good in general. For it treats these capacities as capable of determining which ends are good, and at the same time as grounding the goodness of the means taken toward those good ends. But to regard one’s capacities in this way is also to take a certain attitude toward oneself as the being that has and exercises those capacities. It is to esteem oneself – and also to esteem the correct exercise of one’s rational capacities in determining what is good both as an end and as a means to it. One’s other capacities, such as those needed to perform the action that is good as a means, are also regarded as good as means. But that capacity through which we can represent the very idea of something as good both as end and as means is not represented merely as the object of a contingent inclination, nor is it represented as good only as a means. It must be esteemed as unconditionally good, as an end in itself. To find this value in oneself is not at all the same as thinking of oneself as a good person. Even those who misuse their rational capacities are committed to esteeming themselves as possessing rational nature. It also does not imply that a more intelligent person (in that sense, more “rational”) is “better” than a less intelligent one. The self-esteem involved in setting an end applies to any being capable of setting an end at all, irrespective of the cleverness or even the morality of the end setting. Kant’s argument supports the conclusion, to which he adheres with admirable consistency throughout his writings, that all rational beings, clever or stupid, even good or evil, have equal (absolute) worth as ends in themselves. For Kantian ethics the rational nature in every person is an end in itself whether the person is morally good or bad.

#### Second, value theory – the existence of extrinsic goodness requires unconditional human worth.

Korsgaard (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) OS \*bracketed for gen lang\* //rct st

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, he or she [they] supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness. Kant considers what this might be: it cannot be an object of inclination, for those have only a conditional worth, "for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity" or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action." By this I understand him to mean that we must regard ourselves as capable of conferring value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize them. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### Third, practical reason – ethical principles must be derived from the structure of reason:

#### [1] Regress – we can always ask why we should follow a theory, so they aren’t binding because they don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so it’s the only thing we can follow

#### [2] Action Theory – every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, i.e. me moving my arm can be broken down to the infinite moments of every state my arm is in. Only reason can unify these movements because we use practical reason to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason

#### Fourth, epistemology – ethics must begin a priori, meaning they can’t be derived from our experience.

#### [A] Representations of space – we can only access our experiences if we can interpret the space around us, but that requires the a priori. Thinking of the absence of space is impossible – we can think of empty space but never the lack of space itself. Imagining space through a priori thoughts is the only way we can even begin to have a conception of interpreting experience; we need to be able to construct space through our minds.

#### [B] Separateness – if space is based on experience, it must be formed from objects separate to us outside of our reasoning abilities. But to represent objects as separate from us, we would already need to assume space exists in the first place to have a concept of “separateness,” so to represent space as something separate from us would be incoherent.

#### [C] Is/Ought Gap – experience in the phenomenal world only tells us what is, not what ought to be. But it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises, so there needs to be additional a priori premises within the noumenal world to make a moral theory.

#### Practical reason means we all have a unified perspective: What can be justified to me can be justified to everyone who is a practical reasoner. If I can conclude that 2+2 is 4, then I understand not only that I know 2+2 is 4, but that everyone around me can arrive at the same conclusion. These things are temporally consistent: I know that me adding two numbers now and taking that sum will not result in me adding the same two numbers in the future and getting a different sum. Our unified perspective does not change but rather stays consistent.

#### But, willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction: If I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too. If I die, I cannot exercise my freedom to kill someone else. This is a contradiction: I both justify extending my freedom to kill others and limiting my own freedom.

#### Thus, the standard is respecting freedom.

## Offense

#### Negate:

#### Acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.

Feser 1, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

#### To own yourself and use your own freedom is to be able to interact with external objects. Anything else makes you unable to exercise your own freedom on other things and creates a contradiction.

Feser 2, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is. An alternative, soft-line approach could acknowledge that the initial acquirer who abuses a monopoly over a water hole (or any similar crucial resource) does commit an injustice against those who are disad- vantaged, but such an approach could still hold that the acquirer never- theless has not committed an injustice in acquisition —his acquisition was, as I have said, neither just nor unjust. Nor does he fail to own what he has acquired; he still cannot be said to have stolen the water from anyone. Rather, his injustice is an unjust use of what he owns, on a par with the unjust use I make of my self-owned fist when I wield it, unprovoked, to bop you on your self-owned nose. In what sense does the water-hole owner use his water unjustly, though? He doesn’t try to drown anyone in it, after all— indeed, the whole problem is that he won’t let anybody near it! Eric Mack gives us the answer we need in what he has put forward as the “self-ownership proviso” (SOP).28 This is a proviso not (as the Lock- ean proviso is) on the initial acquisition of property, but rather on how one can use his property in a way that respects others’ self-ownership rights. It is motivated by consideration of the fact that the talents, abilities, capac- ities, energies, etc., that a person rightfully possesses as a self-owner are inherently “world-interactive”; that is, it is of their very essence that they are directed toward the extra-personal environment.29 Your capacity to use your hand, for instance, is just a capacity to grasp and manipulate external objects; thus, what you own in owning your hand is something essentially grasping and manipulating.30 Now if someone were to cut off your hand or invasively keep you from using it (by tying your arm against your body or holding it behind your back), he would obviously be violating your self-ownership rights. But there are, Mack suggests, other, noninvasive ways in which those rights might be violated. If, to use an example of Mack’s, I effectively nullify your ability to use your hand by creating a device that causes anything you reach for to be propelled beyond your grasp, making it impossible for you ever to grasp or manip- ulate anything, I have violated your right to your hand as much as if I had cut it off or tied it down. I have, in any case, prevented your right to your hand from being anything more than a formal right, one that is practically useless. In the interests of guaranteeing respect for substantive, robust rights of self-ownership, then, “[t]he SOP requires that persons not deploy their legitimate holdings, i.e., their extra-personal property, in ways that severely, albeit noninvasively, disable any person’s world-interactive powers.” 31 The SOP follows, in Mack’s view, from the thesis of self-ownership itself; or, at any rate, the considerations that would lead anyone to accept that thesis should also, in his view, lead one to accept the proviso.32 A brief summary of a few of Mack’s thought experiments should suffice to give a sense of why this is so.33 In what Mack calls the Adam’s Island example, Adam acquires a previously uninhabited island and later refuses a shipwrecked Zelda permission to come ashore, as a result of which she remains struggling at sea (and presumably drowns). In the Paternalist Caging example, instead of drowning, Zelda becomes caught offshore in a cage Adam has constructed for catching large sea mammals, and, rather than releasing her, Adam keeps her in the cage and feeds her regularly. In the Knuckle-Scraper Barrier example, Zelda falls asleep on some unowned ground, whereupon a gang of oafish louts encircles her and, using their bodies and arms as barriers, refuses to let her out of the circle (accusing her of assault if she touches them in order to climb over or break through). In the Disabling Property Barrier example, instead of a human barrier, Adam constructs a plastic shield over and around the unowned plot of ground upon which Zelda sleeps, accusing her of trespassing upon his property when she awakens and tries to escape by breaking through the plastic. And in the (similarly named) Disabling Property Barriers example, seem to suggest an Aristotelian-Thomistic conception of natural function, and though this by no means troubles me, it might not be what Mack himself has in mind (nor, of course, is it something every philosopher is going to sympathize with). Mack’s view nevertheless seems to require something like this conception. And something like it —enough like it to do the job Mack needs to be done, anyway—is arguably to be found in Larry Wright’s well- known reconstruction, in modern Darwinian terms, of the traditional notion of natural function. See Larry Wright, “Functions,” Philosophical Review 82, no. 2 (1973): 139–68. Adam, instead of enclosing Zelda in a plastic barrier, encloses in plastic barriers every external object that Zelda would otherwise be able to use — thus, in effect, enclosing her in a larger, all-encompassing plastic barrier of a more eccentric shape. In all of these cases, Mack says, although Zelda’s formal rights of self-ownership have not been violated—no one has invaded the area enclosed by the surface of her skin —her rights over her self-owned powers, and in particular her ability to exercise those powers, have nevertheless been nullified. But a plausible self-ownership- based theory surely cannot allow for this. It cannot, for instance, allow the innocent Zelda justly to be imprisoned in any of the ways described! If Mack is right, then it seems we have, in the SOP, grounds for holding that a water-hole monopolist would indeed be committing an injustice against anyone he refuses water to, or to whom he charges exorbitant prices for access. The injustice would be a straightforward violation of a person’s rights to self-ownership, a case of nullifying a person’s self- owned powers in a way analogous to Adam’s or the knuckle-scrapers’ nullification of Zelda’s self-owned powers. It would not be an injustice in initial acquisition, however. The water-hole monopolist still owns the water hole as much as he ever did; he just cannot use it in a way that violates other individuals’ self-ownership rights (either by drowning them in it or by nullifying their self-owned powers by denying them access to it when there is no alternative way for them to gain access to the water necessary for the use of their self-owned powers). Is Mack right? The hard-liner might dig in his heels and insist that none of Mack’s examples amount to self-ownership-violating injustices; instead, they are merely subtle but straightforward property rights violations or cases of moral failings of various other sorts (cruelty, selfishness, etc.). The Adam’s Island case, for starters, is roughly analogous to the example of the water-hole monopolist, so that it arguably cannot give any non-question- begging support to the SOP, if the SOP is then supposed to show that the water-hole example involves an injustice. The Disabling Property Barriers case might also be viewed as unable to provide any non-question-begging support, since Adam’s encasing everything in plastic might plausibly be interpreted as his acquiring everything, in which case we are back to a water-hole-type monopoly example. The Knuckle-Scraper Barrier and Dis- abling Property Barrier examples might be explained by saying that in falling asleep on the unowned plot of land, Zelda in effect has come (at least temporarily) to acquire it, and (by virtue of walking) to acquire also the path she took to get to it, so that the knuckle-scrapers and Adam violate her property rights (not her self-ownership rights) in not allowing her to escape. The Paternalist Caging example can perhaps be explained by arguing that in building the cage, Adam has acquired the water route leading to it, so that in swimming this route (and thus getting caught in the cage) Zelda has violated his property rights and, therefore, can justly be caged. Accordingly, the hard-liner might insist, we can explain all of these examples in a hard-line way and thus avoid commitment to the SOP. Such a hard-line response would be ingenious (well, maybe), but still, I think, ultimately doomed to failure. Can the Paternalist Caging example, to start with, plausibly be explained away in the manner that I have suggested? Does Adam commit no injustice against Zelda even if he never lets her out? It will not do to write this off merely as a case of excessive punishment (explaining the injustice of which would presumably not require commitment to the SOP). For suppose Adam says, after a mere five minutes of confinement, “I’m no longer punishing you; you’ve paid your debt and are free to go, as far as I’m concerned. But I’m not going to bother exerting the effort to let you out. I never forced you to get in the cage, after all —you did it on your own —and you have no right to the use of my self-owned cage-opening powers to fix your mistake! So teleport out, if you can. Or get someone else —if you can find someone —to let you out.” Adam would be neither violating Zelda’s rights to external property nor excessively punishing her in this case; nor would he be invasively vio- lating her self-ownership rights. But wouldn’t he still be committing an injustice, however noninvasively? Don’t we need something like the SOP to explain why this is so? The barrier examples, for their part, do not require Zelda’s walking and falling asleep on virgin territory, which thus (arguably) becomes her prop- erty. We can, to appeal to the sort of science-fiction scenario beloved of philosophers, imagine instead a bizarre chance disruption of the structure of space-time that teleports Zelda into Adam’s plastic shell or into the midst of the knuckle-scrapers. There is no question now of their violating her property rights; yet don’t they still commit an injustice by nullifying her self-owned powers in refusing to allow her to exit? Consider a parallel example concerning property ownership itself. If your prized $50,000 copy of Captain America Comics number 1, due to another rupture in space-time or just to a particularly strong wind that blows it out of your hands and through my window, suddenly appears on the floor of my living room, do I have the right to refuse to bring it back out to you or to allow you to come in and get it? Suppose I attempt to justify my refusal by saying, “I won’t touch it, and you’re free to have it back if you can arrange another space-time rupture or gust of wind. But I refuse to exert my self-owned powers to bring it out to you, or to allow you on my property to get it. I never asked for it to appear in my living room, after all!” Would anyone accept this justification? Doesn’t your property right in the comic book require me to give it back to you? The hard-liner might suggest that this example transports the SOP advocate out of the frying pan and into the fire. For if the SOP is true, wouldn’t we also have to commit ourselves to a “property-ownership proviso” (POP) that requires us not to nullify anyone’s ability to use his external private property in a way consistent with its “world-interactive powers”? If I build a miniature submarine in my garage, and you have the only swimming pool within one thousand miles, must you allow me the use of your pool lest you nullify my ability to use the sub? If (to take an example of Cohen’s cited by Mack) I own a corkscrew, must I be provided with wine bottles to open lest the corkscrew sadly fail to fulfill its full potential?34 Mack’s response to this line of thought seems basically to amount to a bit of backpedaling on the claim that his proviso really follows from the notion of self-ownership per se —so as to avoid the conclusion that a (rather unlibertarian and presumably redistributionist) POP would also, in par- allel fashion, follow from the concept of property ownership. His response seems, instead, to emphasize the idea that the considerations favoring self-ownership also favor, via an independent line of reasoning, the SOP.35 In my view, however, a better response would be one that took note of some relevant disanalogies between property in oneself and property in external things. Note first that the self-owned world-interactive powers, the possible use of which the SOP is intended to guarantee, are possessed by a living being who is undergoing development, which involves passing through various stages; therefore, these powers are ones that flourish with use and atrophy or even disappear with disuse.36 To nullify these powers even for a limited time, then, is (very often at least) not merely temporarily to inconvenience their owner, but, rather, to bring about a permanent reduc- tion or even disablement of these powers. By contrast, a submarine (or a corkscrew) retains its powers even when left indefinitely in a garage (or a drawer). This difference in the effect that nullification has on self-owned powers versus extra-personal property plausibly justifies a difference in our judgments concerning the acceptability, from the point of view of justice, of such nullification in the two cases; that is, it justifies adoption of the SOP but not of the POP.37 Second, there is an element of choice (and in particular, of voluntary acquisition) where extra-personal property is concerned that is morally relevant here. One’s self-owned powers, along with the SOP-guaranteed right to the non-nullification of those powers, are not something one chooses or acquires; one just has them —indeed, to a great degree one just is the constellation of those powers, abilities, etc.—and owns them fully. By contrast, extra-personal property is something one chooses to acquire or not to acquire, and as we have seen, one always acquires property rights in various degrees, from partial to full ownership—and this would include the rights guaranteed by a POP. If one chooses to acquire a corkscrew under conditions where wine bottles are unavailable, or are even likely at some point to become unavailable, one can hardly blame others if one finds oneself bottle-less. To fail to acquire POP-like rights regarding the corkscrew (by, say, contracting with someone else to provide one with wine bottles in perpetuity) is not the same thing as to have those rights and then have them violated. Someone who buys a corkscrew and then finds that he cannot use it is like the person who acquires only partial property rights in a water hole that others have already acquired partial use rights over. He cannot complain that his co-owners have violated his rights; he never acquired those other rights in the first place. Similarly, the corkscrew owner cannot complain that he has no bottles to open; he never acquired the right to those bottles, only to the corkscrew. If full ownership of a corkscrew requires POP-like rights over it, then all that follows is that corkscrew owners who lack bottles are not full owners of their corkscrews.

#### Counterplan: States ought to establish a governing authority to distribute property to private entities

#### The net benefit is preemptive – if they say that kant affirms because there is no state in space we solve this by putting a state in space

# Case

## Substance

### Ozone

#### Ozone Layer is increasing – flips U/Q.

Horton 21 Helena Horton 9-15-2021 "‘Larger than usual’: this year’s ozone layer hole bigger than Antarctica" <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/sep/16/larger-than-usual-ozone-layer-hole-bigger-than-antarctica> (Environmental Journalist for the Guardian)//Elmer

The hole in the ozone layer that develops annually is “rather larger than usual” and is currently bigger than Antartica, say the scientists responsible for monitoring it. Researchers from the Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service say that this year’s hole is growing quickly and is larger than 75% of ozone holes at this stage in the season since 1979. Ozone exists about seven to 25 miles (11-40km) above the Earth’s surface, in the stratosphere, and acts like a sunscreen for the planet, shielding it from ultraviolet radiation. Every year, a hole forms during the late winter of thesouthern hemisphere as the sun causes ozone-depleting reactions, which involve chemically active forms of chlorine and bromine derived from human-made compounds. In a statement Copernicus said that this year’s hole “has evolved into a rather larger than usual one”. Vincent-Henri Peuch, the service’s director, told the Guardian: “We cannot really say at this stage how the ozone hole will evolve. However, the hole of this year is remarkably similar to the one of 2020, which was among the deepest and the longest-lasting – it closed around Christmas – in our records since 1979.

#### Dichloromethane thumps

Perkins 17 Sid Perkins 6-27-2017 "New threat to ozone layer found" <https://www.science.org/content/article/new-threat-ozone-layer-found> (Sid is a freelance science journalist based in Crossville, Tennessee. He specializes in earth sciences and paleontology but often tackles topics such as astronomy, planetary sciences, materials sciences, and engineering. Sid has a bachelor’s degree in natural science from Christian Brothers College in Memphis, Tennessee; bachelor’s and master’s degrees in aeronautical engineering from the Air Force Institute of Technology in Ohio; and a master’s degree in journalism from the University of Missouri in Columbia)//Elmer

The ozone layer—a high-altitude expanse of oxygen molecules that protects us from the sun's ultraviolet rays—has been on the mend for the past decade or so. But a newly discovered threat could delay its recovery. Industrial emissions of a chemical commonly used in solvents, paint removers, and the production of pharmaceuticals have doubled in the past few years, researchers have found, which could slow the healing of the ozone layer over Antarctica anywhere between 5 and 30 years—or even longer if levels continue to rise. The findings are "frightening" and "a big deal," says Robyn Schofield, an environmental scientist at the University of Melbourne in Australia who was not involved with the work. The chemical in question is called dichloromethane (CH2Cl2). Natural sources of this substance are small, says Ryan Hossaini, an atmospheric chemist at Lancaster University in the United Kingdom. Thus, he notes, the increase in emissions seen in recent years likely stems from human sources. Between 2000 and 2012, low-altitude concentrations of CH2Cl2 vapor rose, on average, about 8% per year, he adds. Globally, concentrations of CH2Cl2 approximately doubled between 2004 and 2014. Current CH2Cl2 emissions are about 1 million metric tons per year, Hossaini and his team estimate. Like chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and several other ozone-destroying chemicals you may have heard of, CH2Cl2 breaks apart when struck by sunlight. The chlorine atoms that are released then dismantle any ozone molecules they interact with. In 1987, an international agreement known as the Montreal Protocol led to a ban on the production and use of CFCs and many related compounds in industrial nations, but it ignored CH2Cl2 because researchers thought it didn't stay intact in the atmosphere long enough to rise into the stratosphere. Recent evidence now suggests, however, that the molecules can reach the lower edge of the stratosphere, which includes the ozone layer, despite its height 8 kilometers above the poles. To gauge the current and future threat to high-altitude ozone from CH2Cl2, Hossaini and his colleagues used computer simulations. In 2016, their analyses suggest, about 3% of the summer ozone loss in the Antarctic could be traced to CH2Cl2. That seems small, but in 2010 the substance was responsible for only 1.5% of the region's summer ozone loss, Hossaini says. If CH2Cl2 emissions continue to rise at the rate seen in the last decade, recovery of the ozone hole would be delayed about 30 years, the researchers estimate in Nature Communications. But if emissions of CH2Cl2 are held to current levels, healing of the ozone hole would be delayed only 5 years or so, the team finds. Simulations that don't include the effect of CH2Cl2 suggest that high-altitude ozone in the Antarctic will return to pre-1980 levels, the concentration measured before CFCs and other ozone-destroying chemicals were recognized as a problem, in 2065. The team's analyses "are quite important," says Björn-Martin Sinnhuber, an atmospheric scientist at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology in Germany. "It's clear that concentrations [of CH2Cl2] have increased quite a lot," he notes. But one critical question, he contends, is what will happen to emissions over the long term: "They've been quite variable in recent years, and it's difficult to say how they might evolve." Although the rapid rise in CH2Cl2 emissions may one day level off, it's also possible that emissions of this multipurpose chemical may accelerate even further. Hossaini and his team also assessed what would happen to high-altitude ozone if CH2Cl2 emissions rose at twice the rate seen in the past decade. The answer? Not good. Antarctic ozone wouldn't recover to pre-1980 levels until well after the year 2100, the analyses suggest. All this means that scientists now reviewing the Montreal Protocol should consider expanding the agreement to also regulate substances like CH2Cl2 that have atmospheric lifetimes of less than 6 months, Schofield says. Possibly as important, however, the team's results might also help other researchers identify which sources of CH2Cl2 are contributing most to the recent rise in emissions. That sort of information, Hossaini admits, is sadly lacking as of now.

#### No Ozone Impact.

Ridley 14 (Matthew White Ridley, BA and PhD in Zoology from Oxford. “THE OZONE HOLE WAS EXAGGERATED AS A PROBLEM,” *Rational Optimist*, 9/25/14, <http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/the-ozone-hole-was-exaggerated-as-a-problem.aspx>) dwc 19

Serial hyperbole does the environmental movement no favours My recent Times column argued that the alleged healing of the ozone layer is exaggerated, but so was the impact of the ozone hole over Antarctica: The ozone layer is healing. Or so said the news last week. Thanks to a treaty signed in Montreal in 1989 to get rid of refrigerant chemicals called chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), the planet’s stratospheric sunscreen has at last begun thickening again. Planetary disaster has been averted by politics. For reasons I will explain, this news deserves to be taken with a large pinch of salt. You do not have to dig far to find evidence that the ozone hole was never nearly as dangerous as some people said, that it is not necessarily healing yet and that it might not have been caused mainly by CFCs anyway. The timing of the announcement was plainly political: it came on the 25th anniversary of the treaty, and just before a big United Nations climate conference in New York, the aim of which is to push for a climate treaty modelled on the ozone one. Here’s what was actually announced last week, in the words of a Nasa scientist, Paul Newman: “From 2000 to 2013, ozone levels climbed 4 per cent in the key mid-northern latitudes.” That’s a pretty small change and it is in the wrong place. The ozone thinning that worried everybody in the 1980s was over Antarctica. Over northern latitudes, ozone concentration has been falling by about 4 per cent each March before recovering. Over Antarctica, since 1980, the ozone concentration has fallen by 40 or 50 per cent each September before the sun rebuilds it. So what’s happening to the Antarctic ozone hole? Thanks to a diligent blogger named Anthony Watts, I came across a press release also from Nasa about nine months ago, which said: “ Two new studies show that signs of recovery are not yet present, and that temperature and winds are still driving any annual changes in ozone hole size.” As recently as 2006, Nasa announced, quoting Paul Newman again, that the Antarctic ozone hole that year was “the largest ever recorded”. The following year a paper in Nature magazine from Markus Rex, a German scientist, presented new evidence that suggested CFCs may be responsible for less than 40 per cent of ozone destruction anyway. Besides, nobody knows for sure how big the ozone hole was each spring before CFCs were invented. All we know is that it varies from year to year. How much damage did the ozone hole ever threaten to do anyway? It is fascinating to go back and read what the usual hyperventilating eco-exaggerators said about ozone thinning in the 1980s. As a result of the extra ultraviolet light coming through the Antarctic ozone hole, southernmost parts of Patagonia and New Zealand see about 12 per cent more UV light than expected. This means that the weak September sunshine, though it feels much the same, has the power to cause sunburn more like that of latitudes a few hundred miles north. Hardly Armageddon. The New York Times reported “an increase in Twilight Zone-type reports of sheep and rabbits with cataracts” in southern Chile. Not to be outdone, Al Gore wrote that “hunters now report finding blind rabbits; fisherman catch blind salmon”. Zoologists briefly blamed the near extinction of many amphibian species on thin ozone. Melanoma in people was also said to be on the rise as a result. This was nonsense. Frogs were dying out because of a fungal disease spread from Africa — nothing to do with ozone. Rabbits and fish blinded by a little extra sunlight proved to be as mythical as unicorns. An eye disease in Chilean sheep was happening outside the ozone-depleted zone and was caused by an infection called pinkeye — nothing to do with UV light. And melanoma incidence in people actually levelled out during the period when the ozone got thinner.

### Debris

#### Collisions now are good---they spur international momentum for STM standards which solves future, deadlier debris and a slew of external impacts

—Sustainable deep spaceflight, GNSS normsetting, GEO orbital slots, and avoiding collisions in LEO and in the air

Larsen 18 – Professor of air and space law for more than forty years at SMU and Gtown

Paul B. Larsen, taught air and space law for more than forty years respectively at Southern Methodist University and at Georgetown University, co-author of Space Law: A Treatise which is THE foundational & ubiquitous space law textbook, ARTICLE: SPACE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STANDARDS, 83 J. Air L. & Com. 360, 2018

This article is about the need for space traffic standards. It specifically focuses on international space traffic standards. Space traffic is currently tracked by radar. But, many objects - mainly space debris - moving in outer space are too small to be [\*361] tracked and are still dangerous. The Kessler Syndrome predicts frequent collisions with increasing space debris in outer space in the near future. A four-fold increase in navigable outer space objects is likely. Therefore, organization of space traffic is urgently needed. INTRODUCTION: INTERNATIONAL MINIMUM SPACE TRAFFIC STANDARDS Existing space traffic management is linked to existing space law, primarily the Outer Space Treaty, the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) legal regime, and the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) space debris guidelines. Currently, there are no "rules of the road" in outer space. Even if one country adopts unilateral space traffic rules of the road, it cannot thereby control the traffic from other countries. Only international traffic rules can establish effective rules of the road for space objects. The premise of this paper is that international minimum space safety regulations will be implemented through domestic laws and regulations, and that international uniformity can be achieved. The minimum space traffic standards would apply to civilian traffic only. There are very successful models for international minimum standards in international civil and maritime transportation. 1Link to the text of the note There are equally successful international standards in international satellite telecommunication. 2Link to the text of the note All these regimes - air, sea, and space - concern safety, control, and management of traffic in territory that is not sovereign and thus not subject to regulation by national states. Besides the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and ITU models, this article also discusses models based on the current Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS)'s work on sustainable action guidelines, the IADC space debris guidelines, the COPUOS efforts to coordinate Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) services, and on traffic data coordination by the Space Data Association. [\*362] These six models should be considered only insofar that any of them or any of their parts suit new space technology. Because of the extreme speed with which objects move, 3Link to the text of the note outer space is inherently ultrahazardous. It is difficult to keep space objects from colliding. The outer space environment is unforgiving. It cannot be repaired. It does not have Earth's capability of constant reconstitution. Thus, huge amounts of dangerous space debris from past space activities have accumulated. For example, the Cosmos-Iridium collision in 2009 and the Chinese destruction of a defunct satellite in 2007 resulted in great increases of space debris. 4Link to the text of the note It is not yet possible to clean outer space. Moreover, outer space is inherently fragile. There is no tolerance of collisions and accidents. At this time, it is as if the world is waiting for major traffic collisions to occur in outer space in order to be motivated to establish international rules of the road. Space traffic management is a public safety issue. This will become evident as outer space collisions begin to multiply. As space traffic is changing from being predominantly military to being mostly civilian, the nature of space traffic management is changing from having a predominantly national security purpose to predominantly addressing the civil issue of public safety. Outer space traffic is expected to increase four-fold in the near term. 5Link to the text of the note The explosive growth of small satellites during the next few years plus the increase in space debris without any immediate prospect of significant debris removal will intensify the dangers. The collision prospects described by the Kessler space debris syndrome are looming. One expert predicts that "from 2036 collisions [will] start to occur regularly[.]" 6Link to the text of the note After that time, it will be increasingly difficult to maneuver satellite traffic adequately to avoid collisions. The greatest traffic danger will be in [\*363] low Earth orbit (LEO) because of the rapid increase in small satellites orbiting in LEO. The Outer Space Treaty, Article VI, 7Link to the text of the note places the duty on the individual states to license and continuously supervise their nongovernmental outer space operators to ensure that they comply with the Outer Space Treaty and other international space law. There are no international space traffic navigation standards and procedures. Currently space traffic management occurs through individual states. There is only negligible international coordination of space traffic such as through the UN space debris guidelines and the ITU regulation of satellite orbits. The great speed with which all objects orbit in outer space makes their coexistence more tenuous. Moreover, the kinds of objects in orbit differ greatly. One of those orbiting objects is the International Space Station with astronauts on board. Fortunately, the space station is constantly being navigated to avoid objects threatening it in orbit. In the future, more inhabited space vehicles aimed for deep space will pass through the earthly orbits of other objects. A major incentive for establishing order in space traffic is that the operators do not want to endanger their satellites in collisions or be subject to interferences. Thus, the operators are practicing maximum space situational awareness. But devastating accidents are beginning to occur. The 2009 Iridium collision with a defunct Cosmos satellite in LEO was a warning. The Chinese annihilation of one of their spent satellites by an anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) in 2007 in LEO illustrates how one collision will result in thousands of additional uncontrolled small space [\*364] debris objects in outer space. 8Link to the text of the note The launching states are responsible for negligent acts in accordance with the Liability Convention, Art. II. 9Link to the text of the note Thus, each satellite operator and its launching state incurs a huge liability exposure by negligently causing debris. In addition to traffic hazards, there are considerable hazards in outer space caused by transit of deorbiting live and defunct space objects requiring coordination with air traffic management. Outer space traffic could safely be managed much more intensely so as to allow more traffic in outer space similar to the way air traffic is managed in air space. 10Link to the text of the note International space flight rules could result in greater efficiency. Space traffic in Geostationary Orbit (GSO), in Mid Earth Orbit (MEO), and in LEO differ in kind and intensity. The GSO is so unique and narrow that the ITU early identified GSO orbital slots as being scarce and requiring special management, including special consideration for the developing countries. 11Link to the text of the note MEO is used by GNSS satellites, 12Link to the text of the note and LEO is used by a variety of small remote sensing communication satellites. Prospectively there will be visits by tourists. 13Link to the text of the note A complication of a different nature is the extensive use of all these orbits by diverse military satellites and weaponry. All these space objects tend to be navigable. International space flight rules would greatly improve space traffic management in GSO, MEO, and LEO.

**A] GEO slots---they creates multiple scenarios for conflict in space**

--Overcrowding GEO makes miscalc more likely – unclear who is responsible for what andn how to decide responsibility

--takes out communication satellites which provide essential early warning

**Klotz 99**—Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command, Barksdale Air Force Base [Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, Jan 1999, Space, Commerce, and National Security, Council on Foreign Relations, p.23-4]

The scramble for geosynchronous slots and frequency allocations may in fact intensify as even more telecommunications satellites are launched and space becomes even more "crowded." For the most part, the ITU has resolved most conflicts. Nevertheless, the occasional breakdowns in the process for managing and regulating this competition give pause for concern. Interference--inadvertent or deliberate--could in fact pose a more immediate threat to U.S. military and commercial interests than any nascent capability on the part of potential adversaries to deliberately attack American space systems in crisis or conflict. The possible interruption of the GPS signal by commercial communications satellites-with all its implications for military operations and the global information infrastructure-is a case in point.

#### B] GNSS---absent management, it’ll be hit, causing escalation

Bowman 18 - Visiting Graduate Researcher, Defence and Military Analysis at IISS

Peter, “Navigation warfare: the battle lines,” International Institute for Strategic Studies, December 21, 2018, https://www.iiss.org/blogs/military-balance/2018/12/navigation-warfare-battle-lines

Military systems are ever more reliant on GNSS for command and control, navigation and precision-guided munition delivery. Such is the importance of satellite navigation systems that they are increasingly the focus of hostile intent to degrade performance or deny access. One vulnerability is embedded in the space-based nature of the system. The thousands of kilometres between the satellite and the receiver mean the signals are relatively weak compared to most other commercial radio signals, which usually must travel only tens or a few hundred kilometres. Jammers can be used to transmit noise over the frequency band used by GNSS to inhibit reception. Comparatively simple and low-cost jammers aimed at interfering with commercial applications are widely available. Jamming and spoofing States and some non-state actors have developed or acquired more sophisticated high-power jammers, with signal emissions frequently registered in Syria, eastern Ukraine and North Korea. In April 2013, navigation systems of South Korean aircraft and mobile telephone networks in the South Korean capital, Seoul, were severely disrupted by a 50-watt jamming system apparently transmitting from North Korea. Along with simple jamming, spoofing devices that intimate true GNSS data have also been developed to manipulate the position and timing solution determined by receivers. While jamming simply removes the ability to receive GNSS signals, spoofing is more insidious, with the potential to sway decision-making and actions by generating false positioning and timing. Today military and civilian groups have the capability to spoof unencrypted GNSS signals with ease. Conventional spoofing techniques, however, are not effective against encrypted military GNSS systems such as the P(Y) version of GPS without prior knowledge of the encryption key. But these signals could be vulnerable to another form of spoofing known as meaconing (masked beaconing). This technique uses a signal repeater to capture and rebroadcast genuine signals with a time offset. In practice, this effect is challenging to produce against advanced receivers with inbuilt signal integrity checks. Given how cheaply and easily jamming and spoofing can be implemented, GNSS denial could become a potent tool available for organisations fighting asymmetric – or tolerance – warfare.

#### Debris now is self-contained---that means accidents now are better

Park 18

Ye Joo Park, citing NASA studies on orbital debris, How Dangerous is Space Debris?, Research Association for Interdisciplinary Studies, RAIS Conference Proceedings, November 19-20, 2018, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1572516, <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3303541>

Other factors to consider concerning collisions in Space While it’s true that there are thousands of space objects directly above Earth in an 800-kilometer band, space is so vast that it’s helpful to pause for a moment and reflect... in the area directly above the entire continental U.S., there are typically only three or four items orbiting above 3.1 million square miles. Therefore, the likelihood of collisions between satellites, spacecraft and orbiting objects is very small (NASA 2018). In fact, in 2013 it was reported that the probability of a collision between an orbiting asset and space debris larger than 1 cm (0.4in.) will be once every 1.5-2 years, according to the Head of the Russian Hall/ History of Space Debris 8 Figure 5 [NASA] Space Agency. This compares with a 2010 estimate giving the likelihood of once every 5 years (Sorokin 2013). The Feasibility of Practically Reducing Space Debris Reducing orbital debris is incredibly difficult. Therefore, the most important action that space experts and policy makers currently recommend is to prevent the unnecessary creation of additional orbital debris. This can be done through prudent vehicle design and operations ((UNOOSA 2014). The International Academy of Astronautics or IAA is a significant, global organization of scientists and space experts from many countries who meet regularly to discuss the importance of space debris as a policy issue. The subject-matter experts of the IAA published their fifth update Situation Report on Space Debris in August 2017 (Bonnal and McKnight 2017). In the executive summary, the IAA reported that if an orbiting satellite impacts with small bits of debris - even as small as 5 mm - the result will be grave, e.g. the collision would likely disrupt or terminate a satellite’s operations (Bonnal and McKnight 2017, 5). The serious warnings expressed in this conclusion are offset by the positive findings of the IAA that there has been a reduction of the space debris created from the two extraordinary satellite destruction events (2007 and 2009) cited earlier in this paper. According to the IAF report, a large amount of debris from the satellite explosions were frictionally burned when reaching the Earth’s atmosphere after gradually sinking due to the scientific principle of atmospheric drag (in the science of Physics), which is a deterioration in the strength of an orbit because of an object hitting gas molecules in space. Small bits of space junk sink as the orbit gets weaker... then they burn. This is a positive trend “for keeping the short-term collision hazard under control at the lower altitudes (i.e., less than 650 km)” (Bonnal and McKnight 2017, 7).